



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LEVASSEUR'S AMERICAN WORKINGMAN.¹

THESE two volumes, comprising more than one thousand pages, are a monument to the painstaking industry, the ripe scholarship and the scientific spirit of their distinguished author. Émile Levasseur, member of the Institute of France, professor of political economy at the College of France and at the *Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers*, vice-president of the International Institute of Statistics and author of a number of works on political economy and on the economic history of France, was commissioned in 1893, by *L'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, to make this investigation into the present condition of the working classes of the United States. He bore a similar commission from *L'Institut de la Société Nationale d'Agriculture* to study our agricultural development; and his volume on this subject, *L'Agriculture aux États-Unis*, published in 1894, has already been reviewed in this journal. The result that crowns his labors is the most complete picture that has yet been written of the contemporaneous social and industrial life and forces of this country, and of the economic conditions controlling their future development. Indeed, there exists no more comprehensive exposition of the present industrial status of any country in any language. He has done for us what none of our own students or statisticians has attempted, on any scale at all comparable in comprehensiveness.

M. Levasseur was especially equipped for this work, apart from his standing as an economist, by a sojourn among us in the year of the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Returning after seven-teen years, he confirmed or readjusted his first impressions; studied the evidences of our intermediate progress, as they appeared at the Chicago Exposition; and passed five months in visiting farms, factories, villages, cities and institutions, in intercourse with our people in every walk of life and in every department of industry, and in gathering the opinions of economists, statisticians, manufacturers, labor leaders and politicians. Those of us who encountered him during his wanderings were impressed by the thoroughness of his methods and the earnestness with which he pursued them—in marked contrast with the superficial investigations of most of the foreigners who come here to write books about us.

¹ *L'Ouvrier américain*. Par Émile Levasseur. Paris, L. Larose, 1898. — 516 and 634 pp.

The results are proof that he sought the truth and that he found it. His controlling motive seems to have been a desire to set down the facts precisely as they exist, with avoidance of individual coloring and personal prejudice, and with a scrupulous fidelity to detail which is at times wearisome and unnecessary. Wherever a topic is approached upon which two opinions prevail each view is set forth with equal fidelity. What he saw is everywhere supplemented by what he has read. His volumes reveal an astonishing familiarity with our interminable literature on the labor question, as it appears in national, state and municipal reports, and in treatises, documents, pamphlets and newspapers. The criticism which American readers will make upon M. Levasseur's use of authorities is that it is indiscriminate, with little attempt to sift and pick, and with scant regard for the relative standing here at home of men whom he is frequently at pains to refute. Everybody who has ever written and dogmatized on the labor question appears here on the same level with everybody else, with results that are at times incongruous. This lack of a nice weighing of the relative value of authorities is the natural consequence of the omnivorous reading of a stranger. It has unnecessarily loaded down the work, without, however, warping or distorting the author's judgment.

M. Levasseur's volumes remind us, by their candor, their freedom from old world prejudices and their judicial spirit, of James Bryce's portrayal of the workings of our civic institutions, of von Holst's study of our constitutional history, and at some points of de Tocqueville's earlier investigations into *Democracy in America*. There is, in fact, a certain kinship between the two French studies of the young and vigorous republic: the one work may, in a sense, be called a sequel to the other—unlike as it is in method and scope—a recasting of the plummet into the waters of democracy after the lapse of sixty years. The keynote of de Tocqueville's volume was the influence of American equality of conditions upon the evolution of social forces, not merely in the United States, but, by constant action and reaction, upon civilization everywhere. M. Levasseur's volumes are, in their essence, a study of the effects of this influence on our material and social progress; and he has reached conclusions which may fairly be said to set at rest the more serious apprehensions which disturbed his distinguished predecessor.

"The future of the American people," wrote Mr. Pidgin, the English author of *Old World Problems and New World Answers*, "is the greatest question of the modern world." So M. Levasseur regards it. We are working out here, he thinks, on a broader scale,

under freer conditions, with a more unrestrained play of economic forces, the same problems which perplex all the great living nations. In depicting our industrial development, M. Levasseur is really writing the world's industrial history, with the United States as a basis, and with constant reference to the points of variation, which appear as he progresses, in the experience of other countries. That we ourselves have this large view of the influence of our destiny upon the rest of the world was constantly brought home to him while he sojourned among us. At times he cannot refrain from gently chiding us for our extravagant language in speaking of our own achievements and possibilities: Among the superlatives with which the Americans describe their establishments, the most usual are "the greatest," "the largest in the world." . . . Success intoxicates; this young nation has grown so fast in a century that she is excusable for believing that nothing equals her grandeur.

American exaggeration amuses him; but it neither pains nor disgusts him, for he finds warrant for it everywhere.

While these volumes are a study of actual conditions in America, they contain also a full development of the author's theory of political science. Cause and effect are inseparably connected, in his mind, with every economic fact of which he treats. He is one of the most distinguished disciples of the modern historical school of political economy, and announces himself as a pupil of Roscher.

It is upon his footprints [says Levasseur] that I have entered by the gateway of history into the domain of the science of political economy. . . . This method has, on the one hand, by enlarging the horizon of the student, confirmed certain of the laws of political economy laid down by the theoretical economists; and, on the other hand, it has disturbed our faith in the universality of others.

He declares that political economy is concerned more closely with moral and social than with physical forces; because, while its theme is wealth, and wealth is material, it treats first of all of the relations between men in the interchange of services and commodities. The close observation of the facts of past and contemporaneous history preserves this school of economists from the danger of losing the sense of reality: it permits the economist

to penetrate into the recesses of the life of nations, and to judge not only the diversity of the phenomena of a particular period, but their variation in the lapse of time; to extend his investigations and the compass (*la portée*) of his doctrines in proportion as the material interests of society extend and modify each other; to show the intimate relation which at all times unites *les choses de l'ordre économique à l'ensemble social*.

Part first of the work opens with a bird's-eye view of the development of the United States, as revealed by the statistics of the federal census. The care with which he has measured the limitations of these statistics is in marked contrast with that lack of care shown by Michael G. Mulhall in a recent magazine article, wherein he accepts the gross total value of our manufactured products of 1890 (\$9,372,437,283) as their real value, and draws therefrom certain deductions, in comparing our industrial development with that of other nations, which are absurd. Levasseur points out that this aggregation of figures is made up of duplications and reduplications of the products of those industries which furnish the raw materials of others, and he readily reduces the total nearly one-half. Some of his criticisms upon our methods of industrial census-taking are just, particularly those relating to the method followed in ascertaining the amount of capital employed ; but the fact remains that our census statistics of manufactures are more complete and more satisfactory than those attempted by any other country.

Making every allowance for possible defects in our standards of statistical measurement, Levasseur agrees that our census returns embody the indisputable proofs of "*un merveilleux progres*"; nor can any American complain of the generosity of his judgment upon the development and the resources of the United States. He says : It is not necessary to exaggerate the favor with which nature has blessed the United States to explain how and why she has accumulated gifts beyond any other land. The genius of enterprise, which manifests itself in the multiplicity of inventions, and in the daring with which the captains of industry undertake new ventures and capital supports them, is undeniable.

The development of industry in the United States is, he thinks, "in its importance and rapidity, a unique phenomenon in the economic history of the world."

Levasseur cites the accelerating tendency towards concentration in all branches of machine industry as the characteristic which most distinguishes American industry from that of other manufacturing countries. This movement is, indeed, visible in every land ; but certain causes tend to expedite it here more than elsewhere. What most impressed him was the rapid transformation of the small factories into large ones, of the large factories into aggregations of factories under a single administration ; and the enormous increase in products from a steadily diminishing number of separate establishments. Prominent among the causes which facilitate this process of concentration, he names "*échantillonnage*" — the interchange-

ability of the parts of machines, permitting instant replacement of worn parts, and the great uniformity of product. This operates both as cause and as effect in the steady movement towards concentration.

A second characteristic which operates in the same direction is the marvellous success of our manufacturers in the application of devices for economizing hand labor. In this particular he finds us far in advance of any European nation. He illustrates the rapidity of the development of our industrial mechanism by this anecdote :

In 1876, when I was in America, they showed me at the Merrimack Mills, as a curiosity, a female weaver who ran seven looms weaving calico, four in front and three behind her ; the other weavers ran four or less. They would hardly believe me when I told this fact in France. In 1893, in the same mill, I saw an entire row of workwomen managing eight looms, four in front, four behind ; the majority of the weavers ran six or four.

To increase production and decrease labor costs, American manufacturers do not hesitate to make old iron out of new machines whenever they can find others which will do the work quicker and cheaper. Herein lies, in his opinion, the chief secret of the so-called "economy of high wages": high wages are not in themselves the cause of cheap production ; but cheapness of production is an effect, indirectly brought about by the necessity of off-setting high wages by resort to more perfect automatic processes. Levasseur illustrates this process in this way : If the manufacturer has an opportunity to introduce a machine costing 50,000*f.* which will displace four workmen, but which he must replace by another in ten years, in a country where the wage is 2000*f.*, he will not hesitate to purchase the new machine, because it will effect a net economy of 3000*f.* ; whereas the manufacturer in a country where the average wage is 1000*f.* will not take the machine, because it will involve a loss of 1000*f.* Thus high wages in the United States are operating steadily to force the substitution of automatic machinery for hand labor. Numerous illustrations are given of nearly automatic production for which he knows no parallel in Europe. He quotes the report of the workingmen's delegates to the Chicago Exposition, that if France, without the protection of a tariff, were called upon to compete with the United States, it would be necessary, as a first step, "to discard all existing machinery."¹

¹ There are two sides to the advantage which comes to the manufacturer by reason of the constant improvements in machinery. Hon. William C. Lovering, of Massachusetts, a member of Congress and a successful cotton manufacturer,

Another cause facilitating and accelerating industrial concentration, M. Levasseur finds, is the remarkable mobility of our industrial population and its freedom from professional traditions. Throughout Europe the population is habituated, from father to son, to the same labor in the same place. In the United States, on the other hand, a new factory, offering good wages, attracts large numbers of workmen, often from a great distance. This exceeding mobility is largely responsible for the fact that American workmen, as a rule, work harder than those of Europe. Working harder, working with better machines and in larger establishments, where all the economies of production can be studied, it follows that "to produce in large quantity, quickly and cheaply, American industry is better equipped to-day, in many lines, than that of any other land in the world." Cheapness of production and sale is the end towards which our manufacturing enterprise chiefly and successfully aims.

Those European manufacturers who scout the idea of any large extension of the foreign trade of the United States, accordingly, in the opinion of M. Levasseur, deceive themselves: "They live under a delusion which time will dissipate." Hence he discards the claim that American industry is any longer in need of protective tariffs. Into his argument against the protective policy we shall not attempt to enter; but it is pertinent to remark that the whole of this first part of the work is a practical demonstration of the fact that the prices of manufactured articles are not permanently enhanced by the operation of protective duties. The forces at work in this country tend steadily towards cheapening the cost of production; and this is the great distinguishing characteristic of American industry to-day.

Whatever tends to this one economic end, without the sacrifice of other essentials, is, in M. Levasseur's philosophy, a distinct gain to civilization. The end of industry is to satisfy the needs of mankind; and whatever helps to do this, as cheapness of production preëminently does, is, in the large view, for the benefit of mankind, in spite of the individual loss and suffering that may temporarily and incidentally

recently called attention to the fact that "a cotton mill wears out faster than any other mill on account of the tremendous speed at which its spindles and looms are run. The moment it begins to lose money it loses very rapidly. Another terror that hangs over the manufacturer to-day is continual invention. He may build the best mill possible and equip it with all the latest and most improved machinery, and the chances are that in a year or two, long before his machinery has begun to wear out, it will become obsolete, so quickly does one invention follow on the heels of another. Therefore it is that new devices and inventions to save labor bear both upon capital and labor."

follow the changes and combinations constantly necessitated to bring it about. The law which steadily crowds industry towards the machine and the big factory is irresistible,

because it leads to the cheapness which consumption seeks before all else, and which is one of the ends of economic civilization. It is a Utopia to believe that the world will return, by some modification of the social order or the motive forces, to the *régime* of the little family shop.

It is, then, perfected machinery, with its accompanying tendencies to concentration, which entrepreneurs, wage earners, economists and reformers must take as the basis of their plans, calculations and forecasts of the future. These tendencies exist, and will intensify; they can be neither prevented nor retarded, nor should they be regretted. They have their *raison d'être*; and it is foolish to attempt to block their development by the artificial restraints of legislation: "*C'est là qu'est l'avenir!*" Nevertheless, the aggrandizement of manufacture has its natural bounds, and there will always remain a large place in the world's economy for the small industries and the small traders.

These conclusions bring Levasseur to the investigation of the "trust" and other forms of business combination which mark the recent development of industrialism. In and of itself, the trust is a legitimate result of the liberty of association; but it is also one of the instances where association, whether of employer or employed, can become subversive of liberty; and always in such a case the intervention of the government for its regulation or suppression is legitimate. The exact limit to which freedom of action in such trade combinations should be permitted is difficult to set. As at present organized and chiefly carried on, trusts are the transitory incidents of an evolution which is sweeping rapidly onwards, transforming the face of society, but always to the advantage of society. Whatever contributes to cheapness of production increases consumption and adds to the sum of human happiness.

Concentration and the indefinite extension of perfected machinery have no terrors for Levasseur from the point of view of a possible overproduction. He quotes the prediction of Sismondi, writing in 1827, that the increase of manufactured products would go on "to a point which passes infinitely [*sic*] the purchasing power of the public," and that "most of the workmen of England will find themselves upon the street, if the establishments employing them are permitted to substitute steam-moved machinery." If the plethora of 1827 has not prevented our generation from consuming a produc-

tion much more abundant in 1895, is it necessary, asks Levasseur, to despair of consuming very much more in the next generation? "The trouble," he concludes, "with the people who argue for chronic overproduction is that they are ignorant of history. If they knew better the experience of the past, they would be less distrustful of the future." The equilibrium between production and consumption, while always unstable, always establishes itself. It may be temporarily disturbed, but it readjusts itself by its own economic volition; and inasmuch as the actual needs of humanity are far from being fully satisfied and can be indefinitely extended, it follows, speaking generally, that "*there is never too much wealth in the world.*"

Such are M. Levasseur's ideas on the economic aspects of industrialism, as exemplified in the experience of the United States. They are marked by the cheerful optimism of a student who has followed the industrial evolution, as it has progressed from century to century and from decade to decade, and who finds that every new phase of development, however startling at first and however productive of temporary disturbance, has worked in the end for the advancement of society as a whole.

In his treatment of the sociological side of the subject, M. Levasseur studies the actual situation of the American workman from every point of view—in his relations to his employer, to his fellow-workman and to the state.

The whole body of our legislative enactments for the regulation of the conditions of labor is closely examined, in comparison with the similar legislation of Europe; and the conclusion is reached that the strategic position of the American workman—his legal rights, privileges and protections—is superior to that of the workman in any other country, England possibly excepted. The influence of democratic institutions in the promotion of the species of class legislation which is called labor legislation is traced, and the recent tendency of these laws is condemned. Factory legislation introduces limitations upon freedom of contract that are repugnant to Levasseur's theories of industrial liberty. The advantage and the necessity of laws which determine hygienic conditions in factories and apply the general police regulation of the state to manufacturing industries he admits, but as to the rest he says:

To any one who knows that liberty and property are essential principles, it is certain, that persons of age, male or female, employers or employees, are and ought to be free to make with one another the contracts of sale or of wage which they desire, provided only that these contracts are not repugnant to morality.

The American workingman, who is responsible for the labor laws, is in danger of forgetting that his wage is proportioned to the productivity of industry and the abundance of wealth. Whatever tends to restrict output, whether it be public law or private regulation of organized labor, reacts in the long run upon the laborer himself.

Then follows a study of the development of trade-unionism in the United States. Organization has, he believes, beyond question strengthened the position of the American workman, and is an instrumentality which the employer must accept in his future dealings with his employees. As to just what direction trade-unionism in the United States is likely to take in the future, M. Levasseur is clearly in doubt. Our legislation on the subject is still in the fluid state ; and whether legislatures are to control trade-unionism, or trade-unionism is to control legislation, is still an open question. The good that trade-unions can accomplish will not be diminished, while their evil results will be restrained, if by law they are made responsible for their acts. An examination of the history and statistics of strikes in the United States convinces him that they are as commonly resorted to here, as an instrumentality for the remedy of grievances and the readjustment of wages, as in any European country ; and in some instances, like the Homestead riots and the Chicago railroad strike of 1894, they have assumed lawless and dangerous phases almost unknown abroad. Nor can he detect any remedy for the future recurrence of strikes, here or elsewhere. Arbitration is an agency most valuable at times ; but its limitations are obvious, and it fails in the emergencies where it is most needed.

He examines the various experiments in profit-sharing in this country and elsewhere, and concludes that none of them can succeed except where both employers and workmen are of choice material, above the average of humanity—a condition which renders profit-sharing at best an uncertain solution of the labor problem, “ which is not soluble.” A practical objection to the general introduction of profit-sharing is the reluctance of the average American workman to bind himself too closely to his employer. Productive coöperation is, for economic reasons, even less promising.

As the case stands to-day, the investigations of M. Levasseur satisfy him that the prevailing wages in the United States are higher than in any European country, and very much higher than in France, Germany and other Continental nations. Admitting the impossibility of establishing any true mean of wages, either here or elsewhere, by reason of the great diversity in the rates which prevail in different

industries and in different branches of the same industry, he hazards the statement that for men the mean daily average in 1893 lay between \$1.75 and \$2.00. This is higher than the average established by an arbitrary calculation based upon the figures of the eleventh census, which returns the average annual earning at \$444. As compared with the rates of wages which prevailed in the first half of the nineteenth century, to-day's wages may fairly be said to show an average increase of 100 per cent. Not merely the nominal, but the actual, wage of the American workman is greater than that of the workman of other countries; because, while the nominal wage tends to increase, the prices of most of the necessities of life tend still more to decrease. Without doubt, the ordinary necessities of the workman, rent alone excepted, quality and quantity alike, "cost rather less than more in the cities of the United States than in those of France, so that his wage is not only nominally, but actually, more than double that of the French workman." Notwithstanding the higher rent he pays, the American workman is in general far better housed than the French or even the English operative; and the number of workingmen who own their own homes is relatively much larger in this country than in any other.

It follows that the American workman has attained a higher standard of living — "*niveau d'existence*" — than is at present possible to the European workman. The typical American workman is a type superior to any other. His superiority is due to his high wage, which has habituated him to a more refined existence; to the public school, which has cast him in the same mould with the French bourgeois; and to the democratic character of the institutions and habits of the nation. Whatever may be the future admixture of different and inferior races through immigration, M. Levasseur expects to see this type maintain itself; and therein, he believes, lies the safety of the nation. This typical American workman has not only steadily improved his standard of living, but is always striving to improve it still farther. This is one explanation of prevalent discontent, which, from this point of view, is not a manifestation to be deprecated.

As to the future rate of wages, he sees no reason to anticipate a decline; for our agricultural and manufacturing industries continue to absorb with ease the influx of immigrants. The tendency is rather toward an advance, but not strongly so; for it is evident that M. Levasseur believes that the share which labor now gets, from its association with capital, has reached in the United States a point beyond which it cannot greatly advance, without depriving capital

of sufficient inducement to continue to furnish employment. He has analyzed the stock arguments of the leaders of trade-unionism, to the effect that under the present industrial *régime* there is an unjust distribution of the products of the joint efforts of labor and capital. To ascertain the fact in this regard is, indeed, one of the main inquiries of the book. He quotes Carroll D. Wright's statement that the wage ought to be in proportion to the profit and vary with it—that "after capital and labor shall have received fixed and reasonable compensation, each for its investment, the net profit of production shall be divided under profit-sharing plans and methods, or through industrial copartnerships." This is "a seducing prospect," he says,

because it seems to realize an idea of justice, but it is not the true theory of wages. The wage earner occupies a different position from the entrepreneur: he has not the same chance of gain, not having the same risks. The wage is relatively fixed, compared to the profit, which is contingent; it precedes or accompanies production, whereas the profit follows the sale, and above all the payment, both of which are future contingents at the moment of production. Among a thousand producers who, at the same time and in the same land, make and sell the same article, there will be perhaps from twenty to forty who make a fortune, some hundreds who vegetate, and more than one who will ruin himself, although all will pay the same wages. Since it is not possible to insist that the workmen of those who lose shall labor gratuitously, how is it possible to claim that the employees of those who prosper have a right to a contingent share in the gains? In both cases the workmen have sold their labor at a price; and one and all have received the same results of their labor and their time.

M. Levasseur detects the existence among our working classes of a strong and growing tendency toward the socialistic movement. Nevertheless, he looks upon socialism—or the present predominating phase of socialism, collectivism—as a merely transitory phase of the popular movement. Socialism will exist, he says, as long as do wages;

but it will take up new dogmas, whenever the mass of its adherents come to realize that its scheme for the revolution of society is impracticable; the theories of to-day will go out of fashion, just as did St. Simonism and Fourierism in former years in France.

The supreme guarantee against collectivism and communism, in his opinion, is their impracticability. Nevertheless, it is not wise to view their propaganda with indifference. Notwithstanding the fact that, from every point of view, the American workman is better off than his fellow-workman in any other land; that he is better situated to-day than at any previous time; that the great majority of

our wealthiest citizens are "*les fils de leurs œuvres*"; that the road to success is open to all; and that there is everywhere visible the influence of education, of inherited regard for law and of a sense of responsibility which comes from democratic surroundings—despite all this, he listens, "not without some complaisance," to teachers who tell him that he is unjustly treated, that he has a right to more than he receives and that the only obstacle to his obtaining more is his employer.

When, in a land where the people can do all, you feed the workman upon hatred of his employer and the rich, and hold out to him revolution by force as the infallible means of bettering his future, one cannot help saying that here is a public danger. If a collectivist society cannot be organized, the organization of actual society can be disturbed.

Against the claims of the agitators M. Levasseur sets five conclusions, which happily embody his social philosophy:

1st. It is not wisdom on the part of the American workman, so fortunately situated, to make himself unhappy through envy of others more fortunate than himself, or to refuse to enjoy the good that he has because his neighbor may have more; this spirit is an impediment to the progress of civilization.

2d. It is not proved that during the nineteenth century the income of the working classes has increased in a lesser degree than that of the majority of the other classes of society.

3d. Modern inventions, scientific and mechanical, have procured for the world certain advantages, which all the inhabitants enjoy equally, whatever their social condition, and irrespective of whether they had any hand in creating these advantages.

4th. The individual contribution of labor to the production of wealth is no greater to-day than formerly, although the production itself is immensely greater.

5th. The profit which the workingman has secured from the progress of industry and the increase of wealth is evident from the great advance which has taken place in his standard of living.

On the whole, he concludes, the outlook for the future is favorable. Every epoch has its special problems. In Europe the communal emancipation in the middle ages and the religious emancipation in the sixteenth century caused long and terrible agitations; "but civilization did not flounder." That which must not be lost sight of is the fact that in the industrial evolution, in the long run, the good gets much the better of the evil; that society has sought and found palliatives to the worst evils; that the increase of wealth has furnished means to apply them more liberally; that it will find and apply others; that

the actual *régime*, that of individual liberty and private property, is a reality long known and tested by hundreds of millions of men.

In the foregoing I have attempted to present a synopsis of M. Levasseur's findings and opinions upon the economic situation in the United States, and not to make any independent study of them, from the standing point of a critic or commentator. It is important to a thorough knowledge of ourselves that we should occasionally see ourselves as others see us; and M. Levasseur is a clear-headed and fair-minded observer, who sees our faults and our weaknesses, but has no disposition to exaggerate or distort them, and whose judgments are kindly and impartial. If his conclusions lack somewhat in definiteness on some of the problems which he faces — if his habit of looking upon all sides of a question leads us at times to conclude that he himself is to be found on none of these sides, it is necessary to admit that his refusal to commit himself demonstrates the absence of the dogmatic spirit. On most of the great economic questions he is sufficiently explicit; while on others he is reserved, because the progress of events compels the impartial student to preserve an open mind. His conclusions cannot, perhaps, be better summarized than by a translation of his final passage:

The American people is astonished at no singularity, and must have a trial of all. But it is not long misled by sonorous words if it finds them empty; it loves the concrete in politics. The democracy which stirs in its breast is subject to tumultuous and disquieting upheavals; but thus far, after each transient ebullition, it has returned to the level of reason and has continued to prosper. The American people has as much faith in its destiny as it has in progress; and, somewhat intoxicated by its prodigious good fortune, it delights in believing that it to-day holds the sceptre of civilization. This optimistic belief is a barrier against the danger of violent revolution. I have no doubt that, in spite of agitations which may be profound, the twentieth century will see yet another increase in the prosperity of the United States. If the next century does not succeed any better than ours in answering pending questions with the aid of chimerical solutions, it will very probably ameliorate the condition of the working class in more than one respect, as the nineteenth century, and especially the last half of the nineteenth century, has already done. And with the same confidence that the Americans have in their future, I may say, with respect to their industry and its problems, what I have already said in speaking of the present difficulties of their agriculture: *Fata viam invenient*.

S. N. D. NORTH.

BOSTON, MASS.